



Shirley S. Abrahamson
Chief Justice

Supreme Court of Wisconsin

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

110 E. MAIN STREET, SUITE 215

P.O. BOX 1688

MADISON, WISCONSIN 53701-1688

Telephone (608) 266-1880

TTY Users: Call WI TRS at 1-800-947-3529; request (608) 266-1880

Fax (608) 267-0640

Web Site: www.wicourts.gov

Diane M. Fremgen
Clerk of Supreme Court

WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT MONTHLY STATISTICAL REPORT

JUNE 2012

This statistical report presents information about the case filings and dispositions of the Wisconsin Supreme Court during the month of June 2012 and to date for the term that began on September 1, 2011.

Opinions Issued by the Court

The Supreme Court issued opinions resolving 13 cases in June. Information about these opinions, including the Court's dispositions and the names of the authoring justices, can be found on the attached table.

	<u>June 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Total number of cases resolved by opinion	<u>13</u>	<u>78</u>
Attorney disciplinary cases	3	34
Judicial disciplinary cases	0	0
Civil cases	8	32
Criminal cases	2	12

Petitions for Review

A total of 67 petitions for review were filed during the month. A petition for review asks the Supreme Court to review the decision of the Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court's jurisdiction is discretionary, meaning that review is granted in selected cases only. In June, the Supreme Court disposed of 76 petitions for review, of which 10 petitions were granted. The Supreme Court currently has 230 petitions for review pending.

	<u>June 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Review filed	<u>67</u>	<u>651</u>
Civil cases	35	327
Criminal cases	32	324

Petition for Review dispositions	<u>76</u>	<u>745</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	40 (6)	372 (34)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	36 (4)	373 (16)

Petitions for Bypass

In June, the Supreme Court received no petitions for bypass and disposed of 0 petitions for bypass. In a petition for bypass, a party requests that the Supreme Court take jurisdiction of an appeal or other proceeding pending in the Court of Appeals. A matter appropriate for bypass is usually one which meets one or more of the criteria for review by the Supreme Court and one the Supreme Court concludes it will ultimately choose to consider regardless of how the Court of Appeals might decide the issues. A petition for bypass may also be granted where there is a clear need to hasten the ultimate appellate decision. The Supreme Court currently has no petitions for bypass pending.

	<u>June 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Petitions for Bypass filed	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>
Civil cases	0	3
Criminal cases	0	1
Petition for Bypass dispositions.....	<u>0</u>	<u>6</u>
Civil cases (petitions granted).....	0 (0)	5 (1)
Criminal cases (petitions granted)	0 (0)	1 (0)

Requests for Certification

During June 2012, the Supreme Court received 3 requests for certification and disposed of 2 request for certification. In a request for certification, the Court of Appeals asks the Supreme Court to exercise its appellate jurisdiction before the Court of Appeals hears the matter. A request for certification is decided on the basis of the same criteria as a petition to bypass. The Supreme Court currently has 3 requests for certification pending.

	<u>June 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
Requests for Certification filed	<u>3</u>	<u>12</u>
Civil cases	3	8
Criminal cases	0	4
Request for Certification dispositions.....	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>
Civil cases (requests granted)	0 (0)	6 (3)
Criminal cases (requests granted)	2 (2)	5 (5)

Regulatory Matters, Supervisory Writs, and Original Actions

During the month, a total of 4 matters within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Court (bar admission, lawyer discipline, and judicial discipline) were filed and 0 such case was reopened. The Supreme Court also received 4 petitions for supervisory writ, which ask the Supreme Court to order the Court of Appeals or a circuit court to take a certain action in a case. No original actions were filed. An original action is a petition asking the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction over a particular matter. When an opinion is issued in these cases, the disposition is included in “Opinions Issued by the Court” above; otherwise, the case is disposed of by order and is included in the totals below. The Supreme Court currently has 40 regulatory matters and 9 petitions for supervisory writ pending.

	<u>June 2012</u>	<u>Term to Date</u>
<u>Filings</u>		
Attorney discipline (including reopened cases).....	4	59
Judicial discipline.....	0	1
Bar admission.....	0	1
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	4	59
Other (including Original Actions).....	0	6
<u>Dispositions by Order</u>		
Attorney discipline.....	1	10
Judicial discipline.....	0	0
Bar admission.....	0	0
Petitions for Supervisory Writ	8	60
Other (including Original Actions).....	2	13

**DECISIONS BY THE
WISCONSIN SUPREME COURT**

OPINIONS ISSUED DURING June 2012

ATTORNEY DISCIPLINE CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2001AP2157-D	Office of Lawyer Regulation (OLR) v. John C. Widule Reinstatement Granted Per Curiam ¹	06/22/2012
2011AP1663-D	OLR v. Gerald D. Stange License Revoked Per Curiam	06/27/2012
2010AP1523-D	OLR v. Joseph W. Weigel Public Reprimand Per Curiam	06/29/2012

CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CASES

<u>Docket No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
2010AP557-CR	State v. Joseph C. Miller Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Crooks, J.	06/12/2012
2010AP232-AC	State v. Abbott Laboratories Remand to Court of Appeals. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Gableman, J. Bradley, J., Crooks, J. and Prosser, J. did not participate.	06/22/2012
2010AP1812	State v. Dimitrius Anagnos Court of Appeals decision reversed and remanded. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Bradley, J. <u>Concurrence:</u> Ziegler, J. joined by Roggensack, J. and Gableman, J. Crooks, J. and Prosser, J. did not participate.	06/26/2012

¹ “Per Curiam” means “by the Court.” Opinions issued *per curiam* are handed down by the Court as a whole.

2011AP1112	Milwaukee Journal Sentinel v. City of Milwaukee Circuit Court reversed and remanded. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Abrahamson, C.J. <u>Concurrence:</u> Prosser, J <u>Concurrence:</u> Roggensack, J., joined by Prosser, J., Ziegler, J. and Gableman, J.	06/27/2012
2010AP258	Theresa C. Weborg v. Donald B. Jenny, M.D. Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Zeigler, J. <u>Concur/Dissent:</u> Abrahamson, C.J., joined by Bradley, J.	06/28/2012
2010AP1599-CR	State v. Lee Roy Cain Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Gableman, J. <u>Concurrence:</u> Abrahamson, C.J.	06/28/2012
2009AP1212 2010AP491	Estate of Brianna Kriefall v. Sizzler USA Franchise, Inc. Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Roggensack, J. <u>Concurrence/Dissent:</u> Abrahamson, C.J., joined by Bradley, J.	06/29/2012
2010AP594	State v. Carl Cornelius Gilbert, Jr. Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Gableman, J. <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, C.J.	06/29/2012
2010AP1155	State v. Price T. Hunt Court of Appeals decision affirmed. <u>Majority Opinion:</u> Gableman, J. <u>Dissent:</u> Bradley, J. joined by Abrahamson, C.J.	06/29/2012